



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/672,413	09/26/2003	Paola Franceschini	01023US01	8421
7590	10/07/2005		EXAMINER	
MARK A. LITMAN & ASSOCIATES			EGWIM, KELECHI CHIDI	
York Business Center			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Suite 205			1713	
3209 West 76th Street			DATE MAILED: 10/07/2005	
Edina, MN 55435				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/672,413	FRANCESCHINI, PAOLA	
	Examiner Dr. Kelechi C. Egwim	Art Unit 1713	

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 September 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 11-20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) 1-20 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1 & 041904.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Election/Restrictions*

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
  - I. Claims 1-10, drawn to a process for synthesizing a particulate copolymer, classified in class 526, subclass 202.
  - II. Claims 11-16, drawn to a particulate copolymer dispersion, classified in class 526, subclass 201.
  - III. Claims 17 and 18, drawn to a photographic material comprising an outer gelatin protective layer prepared with the polymer from group I, classified in class 396, subclass 661.
  - IV. Claims 19 and 20, drawn to a microparticle comprising the polymer from group I, classified in class 396, subclass 661.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

2. Invention I is related to inventions II-IV as process of making and products made.

The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case, the particulate polymer could be prepared by a different process other than that of Group I, for instance without the initial viscosity control and the process as claimed can ultimately be used to make at least three different products, as evidenced by inventions II-IV.

3. Inventions II is related to inventions III and IV as mutually exclusive species in intermediate-final product relationships. Distinctness is proven for claims in this relationship if the intermediate product is useful to make other than the final product (MPEP § 806.04(b), 3rd paragraph), and the species are patentably distinct (MPEP § 806.04(h)). In the instant case, the intermediate product is deemed to be useful as a binders in coatings and adhesives for various substrate, such as wood, and the inventions are deemed patentably distinct since there is nothing on this record to show them to be obvious variants. Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions anticipated by the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.
4. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
5. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for Group I, III and IV is not required for Group II, the search required for Group III is not required for Groups I, II or IV, and the search required for Group IV is

not required for Groups I, II or III, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

6. During a telephone conversation with Mark A. Litman on 9/16/05, a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-10. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 11-20 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103***

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1, 2 and 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goldberg et al. (USPN 3,301,809) and claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in

the alternative, 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sekmakas (USPN 4,076,677) or Kun Cao et al. (Macromol. Symp. 150, 2000, pp. 195-200).

In col. 1, lines 67-72, col. 2, lines 65-70 and col. 3, lines 29-50, Goldberg et al. teach synthesizing of particulate copolymers comprising providing a mixture of a medium, a polymerization stabilizer, a water- insoluble ethylenically unsaturated monomer and an ethylenically unsaturated monomer containing hydrophilic functionality, said reaction mixture having a viscosity value of 500 to 10000 cps measured at 25<sup>0</sup>C, and polymerizing the monomers.

Each of Sekmakas (see abstract, col. 2, line to col. 3, line 39, col. 4, lines 22-25, and the examples) or Kun Cao et al. (See entire article) individually teach synthesizing of particulate copolymers comprising providing a reaction mixture comprising a water/alcohol medium, a polymerization stabilizer, a water-insoluble ethylenically unsaturated monomer and an ethylenically unsaturated monomer containing hydrophilic functionality, and polymerizing the monomers.

While Goldberg et al., Sekmakas or Kun Cao et al. may not expressly teach the determination of pre-reaction viscosities measured at 40<sup>0</sup>C of the reaction mixtures, it is reasonable that the pre-reaction viscosities of Goldberg et al., Sekmakas or Kun Cao et al. would be essentially the same as in the claimed process since the compositions of the prior art reaction mixtures are essentially be the same as in the claimed process and the USPTO does not have at its disposal the tools or facilities deemed necessary to make physical determinations of the sort. In any event, an otherwise old process is not

patentable regardless of any new or unexpected properties. In re Fitzgerald et al., 619 F.2d 67, 205 USPQ 594 (CCPA 1980). See MPEP § 2112 - § 2112.02.

Even if assuming that the prior art references do not meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 102, it would still have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to arrive at the same inventive process because the disclosure of the inventive subject matter appears within the generic disclosure of the prior art.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dr. Kelechi C. Egwim whose telephone number is (571) 272-1099. The examiner can normally be reached on M-T (7:30-6:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wu can be reached on (571) 272-1114. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



KCE

KELECHI C. EGWIM PH.D.  
PRIMARY EXAMINER